

Application Number	12/0614/FUL	Agenda Item	
Date Received	16th May 2012	Officer	Mr John Evans
Target Date	17th July 2012		
Ward	Market		
Site	Radcliffe Court Rose Crescent Cambridge CB2 3LR		
Proposal	Replacement facade to the existing residential flats' common parts entrances at ground and second floor levels and associated refurbishment.		
Applicant	c/o CBRE Investors 21 Bryanston Street London W1H 7PR		

SUMMARY	<p>The development accords with the Development Plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>The development does not accord with the Development Plan for the following reason:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed new entrances will not harm the character and appearance of the Listed Building or street scene. 2. The design of the doorway has a recessed intercom panel to reduce the likelihood of anti social behaviour. 3. The development will improve the amenity for residents.
RECOMMENDATION	APPROVAL

1.0 SITE DESCRIPTION/AREA CONTEXT

- 1.1 Radcliffe Court lies within Rose Crescent close to Market Street and the Market Square. Rose Crescent is a pedestrian shopping street which links Market Street with Trinity Street. The buildings which line either side of the Crescent are Grade II listed and provide A1 and A3 uses on the ground floor, with a mixture of offices and residential accommodation on the upper floors.
- 1.2 The site lies on the eastern side of Rose Crescent just before the bend and consists of 18 residential flats. The site falls within the Central Conservation Area.

2.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 Permission is sought for the replacement of the facade to the existing residential flats entrance at the ground and second floor level.
- 2.2 The new entrance frontage to Rose Crescent is traditional in style. The upper level new entrance to Radcliff Court is contemporary in appearance with full height glazing.
- 2.3 The internal corridors will also be redecorated.
- 2.4 Permission was granted for a new entrance in the style of a shopfront in 2010, but the applicant does not wish to implement this scheme.
- 2.5 The application is accompanied by the following supporting information:
1. Design and Access Statement

3.0 SITE HISTORY

Reference	Description	Outcome
09/0070/FUL	Removal of existing glazing and doorway that currently forms the ground floor entrance to Radcliffe Court flats and replace with new entrance door	Refused

09/0006/LBC	and glazing. Removal of existing glazing and doorway that currently forms the ground floor entrance to Radcliffe Court flats and replace with new entrance door and glazing which compliments the surrounding shopfronts.	Refused
10/0104/FUL	Removal of existing glazing and doorway that currently forms the ground floor entrance to Radcliffe Court flats and replace with new entrance door and glazing which compliments the surrounding shopfronts.	Approved
10/0089/LBC	Removal of existing glazing and doorway that currently forms the ground floor entrance to Radcliffe Court flats and replace with new entrance door and glazing which compliments the surrounding shopfronts.	Approved
12/0128/FUL	Replacement facade to the existing residential flats' common parts entrances at ground and second floor levels and associated refurbishment.	Withdrawn
12/0129/LBC	Replacement facade to the existing residential flats' common parts entrances at ground and second floor levels and associated refurbishment.	Withdrawn
12/0130/FUL	Installation of new fixed walkway structure and seating areas within external courtyard area and other miscellaneous works including installation of fixed planters, rendering of walls and new signage.	Refused

The scheme **09/0070/FUL** was refused for the following reason:

The proposed alterations to the access to Radcliffe Court are unacceptable in that the design has not drawn inspiration from the

key characteristics of Rose Crescent and fails to provide a recess, leaving the bell plate in an exposed position where it is both unsightly and likely to be misused. The proposal will not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area within which it is located. For these reasons the proposal constitutes poor design that is out of context and is contrary to policies 3/4 and 4/11 of the Cambridge Local Plan (2006).

4.0 PUBLICITY

- 4.1 Advertisement: Yes
 Adjoining Owners: Yes
 Site Notice Displayed: Yes

5.0 POLICY

PLAN	POLICY NUMBER
Cambridge Local Plan 2006	3/4 3/15
	4/10 4/11

City Wide Guidance

The Cambridge Shopfront Design Guide (1997)

Area Guidelines

Cambridge Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal (2006)

6.0 CONSULTATIONS

Cambridgeshire County Council (Transport)

- 6.1 No objections.

Historic Environment Manager

- 6.2 No objections, traditional design acceptable.

Cambridge City Council Access Officer

- 6.3 The intercom should have a hearing loop and tactile buttons.

6.4 The above responses are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the consultation responses can be inspected on the application file.

7.0 REPRESENTATIONS

7.1 Councillor Rosenstiel has commented on this application. I have set out his comments below:

The concern I raised about the arrangement of the bell system is one that was a reason for the area committee refusing a previous application as it is likely to encourage anti-social behaviour by misuse of the bells. That seems a good reason to bring it back to the same committee. I believe there are others security concerns due to the glazed front encouraging attempts to break into the premises. So I am so requesting please.

7.2 The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:

1 Radcliff Court, 8 Radcliff Court.

7.3 The representations can be summarised as follows:

Design objections

- Unhappy with the Architectural design in the Conservation Area.
- The proposed 'bulkhead' over the street entrance is less bulky than at present.

Crime and security concerns

- Timeline of crime and trespassing on 12/0128/FUL case still apply.
- Security is the concern, which has not been addressed.
- The glass needs to be frosted and the lettering needs to be smaller.
- On Friday and Saturday night jobs can see in and are tempted to break in.
- The rear access via McDonalds is never properly shut which is a security risk.
- Letter boxes are visible from outside and would be a reduction in security.

- The stairway pavilion is in green glass which is less in harmony than the original application.

7.4 The above representations are a summary of the comments that have been received. Full details of the representations can be inspected on the application file.

8.0 ASSESSMENT

8.1 From the consultation responses and representations received and from my inspection of the site and the surroundings, I consider that the main issues are:

1. Context of site, design and external spaces
2. Residential amenity
3. Third party representations

Context of site, design and external spaces

8.2 The key design issue is the impact of the new entrance on the character and appearance of the Listed Building and Conservation Area.

8.3 The traditionally designed entrance to Rose Crescent reflects the uniformity which has been partially restored in recent years. While the entrance to the flats is not the same as a shop, maintaining the visual consistency from the street is important. The previously refused shopfront application (09/0070/FUL) failed to achieve this, by reason of its contrasting contemporary design.

8.4 This revised scheme is similar to the approved 10/0104/FUL application. This approval proposed an entrance similar in style to the adjacent shopfronts. The applicant does not wish to implement this scheme.

8.5 The Council's Conservation Officer supports the current proposal and I do not consider there to be any harm to the character and appearance of the Listed Building or Conservation Area, subject to joinery details being agreed.

8.6 I do not consider the glass to the main entrance needs to be frosted. This would have a negative appearance on the street

scene. I am unsure whether clear glass will necessarily encourage criminal behaviour and I give greater weight to achieving a satisfactory visual appearance in the street scene.

- 8.7 The contemporary designed upper floor entrance to Radcliff Court will improve the character and appearance of the concourse.
- 8.8 In my opinion the proposal is compliant with Cambridge Local Plan (2006) policies 3/4, 3/15, 4/10 and 4/11.

Residential Amenity

Amenity for future occupiers of the site

- 8.9 The revised entrance and corridor refurbishment will improve the amenities of occupants of Radcliff Court, because of the new access code system. The redecorated corridors will also revive a tired and dilapidated interior.
- 8.10 The previous application 09/0070/FUL was refused due to the lack of a recess and concerns with misuse of the entry system. The entrance now has a recessed area for the door entry. In my view the design of the entrance has taken account of potential bell misuse and is acceptable.

Third Party Representations

On Friday and Saturday night jobs can see in and are tempted to break in.

I do not believe that frosted glass will solve this issue.

Residents can request from their landlord that frosted panels be installed if that is their wish.

The specific arrangement for access, mail boxes and door locks is the responsibility of the landlord and is not within the planning remit of this application.

The rear access via McDonalds is never properly shut which is a security risk.

This needs to be taken up with the landlord and cannot be resolved through this planning application.

9.0 CONCLUSION

- 9.1 The proposed shopfront will not detract from the character and appearance of the Listed building or wider Conservation Area. APPROVAL is recommended.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Reasons for Approval

1. This development has been approved, conditionally, because subject to those requirements it is considered to conform to the Development Plan as a whole, particularly the following policies:

Cambridge Local Plan (2006): 3/4, 3/15, 4/10, 4/11

2. The decision has been made having had regard to all other material planning considerations, none of which was considered to have been of such significance as to justify doing other than grant planning permission.

These reasons for approval can be a summary of the reasons for grant of planning permission only. For further details on the decision please see the officer report online at www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess or visit our Customer Service Centre, Mandela House, 4 Regent Street, Cambridge, CB2 1BY between 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985

Under Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972, the following are Background papers for each report on a planning application:

1. The planning application and plans;
2. Any explanatory or accompanying letter or document from the applicant;
3. Comments of Council departments on the application;
4. Comments or representations by third parties on the application as referred to in the report plus any additional comments received before the meeting at which the application is considered; unless (in each case) the document discloses “exempt or confidential information”
5. Any Structure Plan, Local Plan or Council Policy Document referred to in individual reports.

These papers may be inspected on the City Council website at:

www.cambridge.gov.uk/planningpublicaccess

or by visiting the Customer Service Centre at Mandela House.